

379  
D37i

# IRISH UNIVERSITY EDUCATION

## ❧ *A Plea* ❧ For Fair Play

By William Delany, s.J.  
*President of University College, Dublin*

*Dublin . Belfast . Cork*

Browne . & . Nolan . Limited

1904

*Price 6d. net*



# IRISH UNIVERSITY EDUCATION

## ❧ *A Plea* ❧ For Fair Play

By William Delany, S.J.  
*President of University College, Dublin*

*Dublin . Belfast . Cork*

Browne . & . Nolan . Limited

1904



## PREFACE.

ON the 30th of December, 1903, the Governing Body of Queen's College, Belfast, addressed a Memorial to His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, in which—having set forth with much power the claims of that institution for increased aid from the public funds—they urged that the consideration of those claims ought not to be postponed until the more difficult question of Irish University Education should be dealt with in its entirety.

I have long admired the excellent work that has been done in Queen's College, Belfast, by distinguished scholars, with many of whom during the past twenty years, my colleagues at University College have been associated in perfect harmony and amity on the Boards of Examiners of the Royal University; I am thoroughly aware of the great need—the absolute, urgent need there is in a great centre of industrial and commercial life such as Belfast—of a teaching institution fully equipped to keep pace with modern scientific developments, if Belfast is to hold its own in the struggle—daily growing keener—of industrial and commercial progress; and I believe that all Ireland would be the richer for the existence of such an institution. But, whilst I, therefore, sympathise most cordially with the perfectly legitimate desire of the Governing Body of Queen's College to have that College thus suitably equipped and endowed, I am, and have been

for many years too painfully familiar with the much more urgent educational needs of the Catholics of Ireland to assent to the proposition that the claims of Belfast Queen's College are fairly entitled to prior consideration.

And, therefore, when this Memorial was brought to my notice early in January, I felt it my duty, as a representative of Catholic educational interests, to submit to the Lord Lieutenant a respectful protest against the granting of such a priority, and to set forth the arguments on which I base that protest; and accordingly I wrote the letter which is here reprinted with some verbal alterations.

In order that the letter might not be unduly lengthened I omitted some important points, which I add now in an Appendix; but in the Appendix, as in the letter, I confine myself to the same simple issue : *a plea for equal treatment and educational fair play.*

WILLIAM DELANY, S.J.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN,

*February, 1904.*

# A LETTER

ADDRESSED TO

**HIS EXCELLENCY THE LORD LIEUTENANT,**

BY THE

**REV. WILLIAM DELANY, S.J.,**

*President of University College, Dublin.*

---

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY,

I have seen in a Belfast newspaper a copy of a Memorial recently addressed to your Excellency by the Governing Body of Queen's College, Belfast, on which I feel it my duty, as President of this College, to submit respectfully for your Excellency's consideration the following observations:—

1. I may say at once that (prescinding from other aspects of the question, and speaking solely from the educational point of view), with the substance and main purpose of the Memorial I am personally in cordial agreement. As a Senator of the Royal University for nearly twenty years, and engaged as I have been for twice that time in education, I am well acquainted with the extent and the quality of the educational work of Queen's College, Belfast; and I entirely concur in the favourable judgment of that work expressed by the

recent University Commission, and in their recommendations that in any new University scheme "a liberal addition should be made to the general endowment of the College." I believe that it would conduce very largely, indeed, not only to the benefit of Belfast and of the Northern province, but to the industrial improvement of the whole country, that there should exist in Belfast a great University College, adequately endowed and thoroughly equipped to meet the requirements of modern scientific and industrial development; and I agree with the authorities of Queen's College that the present endowment and equipment fall very short of these requirements; and that it is, therefore, a matter of pressing urgency that adequate provision should be made for that purpose.

But, whilst I so far concur most cordially in the substance of the Memorial, when it is further suggested that the claims of Belfast Queen's College should be at once separately dealt with on their own merits, and should not be held over for consideration as part of a scheme for reorganising Irish University Education, I feel it my duty, as President of University College, to enter a respectful protest against the adoption of such a course of action.

And I do so on the plain and simple issue of educational fair play and of the equitable and economic distribution of public educational funds, setting aside for the moment all the other considerations of public policy that are involved in the University Question, or that relate to the manner of its solution.

I submit that if a record of good work done under some disadvantages, and the demand of a great community to have the institution doing that work made



adequate to their wants and suitable to the educational necessities of the times—if these conditions constitute a just claim for urgency in dealing with Belfast Queen's College, I submit that the record of work done in University College under much graver disadvantages, and the demand of the far larger community which it represents, to have provided for *them* an educational institution adequate to *their* wants and suitable to present educational requirements, constitute a much more valid and equitable claim for urgency in dealing with the whole Irish University Question.

Here are the facts and figures on which I rest that argument, and to which I respectfully ask attention.

I assume—as an admitted principle of equitable, economic administration of public educational funds—that the endowments granted to public teaching institutions should bear some reasonable proportion to the quantity and quality of the educational work which they accomplish; that institutions which have proved their success should be fostered and developed; and that where institutions after years of trial have proved a failure, the public funds should no longer be wasted on them.

Bearing this principle in mind, I proceed to apply it to the present distribution of public funds on higher education in Ireland. Apart from Trinity College, with its income of £38,000 a year,\* there are four Colleges for higher education endowed from public funds; the three Queen's Colleges and University College, Dublin. The Queen's Colleges receive a yearly grant of £21,000 from the Consolidated Fund, and additional grants under

\* See Appendix, page 30, with regard to Trinity College.

various heads in the yearly estimates. The estimates for the past three years, 1901-2-3, show that the total expenditure on the three Colleges in these years amounted respectively to £34,098, £34,916, £34,966; and this last sum, £34,966, is also the estimate for the current year 1903-4. If we add to these sums the charge involved in the original outlay of £100,000 on buildings and equipment—equivalent to £3,000 a year—we find that the total expense to the taxpayers of the United Kingdom amounts, roughly, to £38,000 a year, or over £12,600 for each College. Along with the Faculty of Arts—which is the main element of Higher Culture in a University—each of these Colleges has Faculties of Medicine, Engineering, and Law; but a comparatively small portion of the funds is expended on these Faculties. If we allow £2,600 for that purpose in each College—a liberal allowance—we find that the Arts Faculty in each of these Colleges is maintained at an expense of £10,000 a year; of that sum more than £1,000 a year in each College is allocated to providing Scholarships, Exhibitions, and prizes in the Faculty of Arts open exclusively to the students of the College; who, notwithstanding, have been, and are at present, permitted also to compete for (and if successful to hold conjointly) the Scholarships, Exhibitions, and prizes of the Royal University against students from Colleges which have no such provisions made for them.\*

\* And this is allowed to take place although there is, in the Act of Parliament, an express enactment that provision should be made to prevent such joint holding, and although, when the question was raised in the House of Commons, Sir Lyon Playfair replied on the part of the Government:—“*It is not true that the Students of Queen's Colleges can add Royal Scholarships or Exhibitions to those which they already possess. If an Undergraduate at a Queen's College gains an Exhibition at the Royal University he must elect which he will hold for he cannot hold both.*” They, therefore, have no advantage over any other

University College has only an Arts Faculty, and receives no endowment from the State. The Senate of the Royal University out of its income of £20,000 a year, derived from the Irish Church Fund, established in 1882 twenty-eight Fellowships, with a maximum salary of £400 a year. The primary duty of these Fellows is to act as Examiners in the Royal University itself; but they are also required to give their services in teaching in a College appointed by the Senate. Of these Fellowships nine were allocated to University College; some years later the number was increased to fourteen, and, on the establishment of a Fellowship in Celtic, to fifteen.

Allowing £100 a year each for the work which these Fellows do as Examiners in the Royal University, the remaining £300 represents the salary given to them for their teaching work in University College, which became thus indirectly endowed (but under conditions open to very grave objections) to the extent of £4,500 a year. Beyond that sum the College has no endowment of any kind; no provision for buildings or equipment; for rent, taxes, or maintenance; for salaries for the President and other executive officers; for scholarships, exhibitions, and prizes.

The four Colleges, thus unequally aided from the public funds, adapt their courses of study to the programmes of the Royal University; the Presidents of the Colleges have a place on the Senate; the main body of the Examiners of the University are Professors in the Colleges; a Professor of University College and a Professor from a Queen's College (aided in the Higher

undergraduate." Plain words, are they not? But, as a matter of fact, the Queen's College students *do* hold both, in the teeth of that declaration: and of what seems the plain meaning of the clause in the Act of Parliament.

Examinations by extern specialists), prepare conjointly the examination papers and mark the answers, and they sit conjointly at the oral examinations; and the students of the four Colleges (along with many others from Colleges which receive no State aid at all), compete annually at the University Examinations.

The results of these Examinations are published in the newspapers and in the University calendars; and these results give a fair measure of the quality and quantity of the work done in the several Colleges in the various branches of Higher Education.

The Registrar of University College has prepared from the yearly calendars a comparative analysis of the results obtained by students of the four Colleges in the Arts Examinations of the past ten years from 1894 to 1903, inclusive, and has furnished me with the following Tables:—

1st. The total number of Prizes, Honours, and Distinctions gained respectively by the students of the four endowed Colleges in that period.

2nd. The number of First Class Honours, Prizes, and Distinctions gained in the same period; and

3rd. The numbers of First Class Classical Honours and of First Class Exhibitions (£42) at the B.A. Honours Examinations, and of Studentships (£300) at the M.A. Examinations, obtained in the same ten years in all the branches of secular learning.

## 1st—Total Number of Distinctions on the whole Course.

Yearly Endowments for Arts Faculties.	1894.	1895.	1896.	1897.	1898.	1899.	1900.	1901.	1902.	1903.	Total.
£4,500 University College ..	87	81	87	82	77	55	57	63	65	50	704
£10,000 Queen's Coll., Belfast..	72	79	74	63	65	70	67	58	40	44	632
£10,000 Queen's Coll., Galway ..	48	25	14	25	14	18	32	26	23	24	249
£10,000 Queen's Coll., Cork ..	12	15	5	7	3	2	5	5	5	6	65

## 2nd—First Class Distinctions only.

£4,500 Univ'sity College ..	45	37	47	49	40	32	33	31	26	34	374
£30,000—											
{ Queen's Coll., Belfast ..	29	34	18	20	28	27	28	25	19	14	242
{ Queen's Coll., Galway ..	8	8	2	11	5	10	9	17	11	5	86
{ Queen's Coll., Cork ..	6	4	2	2	1	..	..	..	2	3	20
											348

3rd—TABLE showing that from 1894 to 1903 in the highest examinations and in all the branches of secular learning, University College competed successfully against the three Queen's Colleges together.

In the year 1897 no First Class Honours in Classics were awarded at the B.A. Honours Examination. In

the other nine years, 1894-1903 twenty-two First Class Honours in all were awarded in Classics, and with these comparative results :—

	1st Place.	2nd Place.	3rd Place.	4th Place.	Total.
University College ..	7	6	2	0	15
Queen's College, Belfast	2	2	0	1	5
Queen's Coll., Galway	0	1	0	0	1
Queen's Coll., Cork ..	0	0	1	0	1

Of the £42 B.A. Prizes in the same period, University College won 30; the three Queen's Colleges 29; (Belfast 22, Galway 6, Cork 1).

Of the Studentships (£300) in the same period, University College won 14; the three Queen's Colleges 13; (Belfast 10, Galway 1, Cork 2); and these Studentships were awarded in the following subjects :—

	Classics.	Mental Science.	Mathematics.	History and Political Science.	Experimental Science.	Modern Literature.	Total.
University College ..	3	4	3	2	1	1	14
Queen's Coll., Belfast	1	2	4	1	2	—	10
Queen's Coll., Galway	—	—	—	—	1	—	1
Queen's Coll., Cork ..	—	—	1	—	—	1	2

I may add that the only two Studentships in Biological Science ever awarded by the University—the only two Gold Medals ever awarded for Latin Verse, and



four of the six Gold Medals for English Prose Composition, were won by Students of University College.\*

In face of these figures, I fail to see how the request of Belfast Queen's College for priority of treatment can be maintained.

Still more do I fail to see on what grounds—educational, economical or political—can the expenditure of £23,000 a year on the Colleges of Cork and Galway in their present condition be defended either in Parliament or elsewhere?†

In face of these facts and figures I may ask, too, what becomes of the charges so flippantly made of "limitations of thought?" of "clerical obscurantism" with regard to scientific teaching; of the "danger of low standards in a Catholic College or University?"

In addition to such charges, the phrases, "sectarian exclusiveness," "clerical seminary," "episcopal domination," "monastic training," and the like, are made to play an important part in discussions on the Irish University Question. I, therefore, venture to add a few words on the position and character of University College, compared, for instance, with Queen's College, Belfast.

#### "SECTARIAN EXCLUSIVENESS" AND "MINGLING OF CREEDS"?

(a) Like the Catholic University, which preceded it, University College is open to students of all denomina-

\* See Appendix, pages 36-41. Copies of Tables which had been submitted to the University Commission, showing that University College received a larger number of the most brilliant boys from the Intermediate Examinations than Trinity College or the Queen's Colleges.

† See Appendix, pages 22-30 for fuller treatment of this question.

tions; and has now, and has had for the past twenty years, a much larger percentage of non-Catholic students attending its classes than Belfast Queen's College has ever had of Catholics.

I may note in this connection, that it is frequently alleged that the grant made by the Irish Parliament for the establishment of the College of Maynooth was given for the common education of laymen and of clerics, and that the Bishops excluded, not only the Protestants, but the Catholic laity from the College. As far back as April 18th, 1845, this charge had been disposed of by Sir Robert Peel in the House of Commons in a debate on the Maynooth Grant.

"We are told," he said, "that this institution of Maynooth is of a monastic and ascetic character. Whose fault is that? Not of the Roman Catholics. In 1795, at the institution of the College, Mr. Grattan presented a petition from the Roman Catholic body against that clause which prohibited the education of Protestants at Maynooth.

"The Trustees of Maynooth College were desirous of establishing a lay College. They did not wish it to be of an exclusive character. They, however, were interfered with and prevented, and Mr. Abbott informed the Secretary that the creation of a lay College would be contrary to the intentions of the Act; and in consequence of the interventions of the British Government it was prevented."—(*Hansard*, vol. 79, p. 1032, April 18, 1845.)

(b) The professorial staff of University College numbers twenty-one members; fifteen professors and six tutors. Five of the twenty-one are priests. Of the fifteen professors eight had won Studentships in the Royal University; another a Gold Medal for excellence; another a special prize of £100; three of them are graduates of Oxford (two of whom won the highest distinctions also in the Royal University); one is



a research graduate of Cambridge, and also a most distinguished graduate of the Royal University; and another was a distinguished scholar and graduate of both the Dublin University and the Royal University.

On that Professorial Staff there have always been one or more Protestant Professors. On the Council of six members which governs the College conjointly with the President (a Council elected by the whole body of Professors) five are laymen, and one of the five is a Protestant.

On the other hand, in Belfast Queen's College *there is not now, and there never has been, a single Roman Catholic Professor in the Faculty of Arts.* Nay more, in 1845, when the Queen's Colleges Bill was before the House of Commons, Sir R. Peel read a letter which he had received from a "Presbyterian clergyman of high character," to this effect:—

"Sir J. Graham appears to have intimated that all religions would be represented in the Professorships. Now I should be acting most unfaithfully to the Government did I not clearly express my conviction that one Roman Catholic or Unitarian Professor in the undergraduate course—I mean the imperative part—would at once decide the General Assembly to withdraw every student. Of this result I entertain not a single doubt. You might indeed appoint an Episcopalian, not known as a Puseyite, as readily as a Presbyterian or a Baptist, Independent, or Methodist, without much dissatisfaction, but not a Unitarian or Roman Catholic Professor."—(*Hansard*, vol. 81, p. 1,087.)

Where, I would ask, has any such menace been given on the part of Roman Catholics? The Government took the warning; they held conferences with the delegates of the General Assembly, Sir Robert Peel gave them "a very strong assurance," and therefore when the

Professors and Deans of Residence were appointed in 1849, the General Assembly passed the following Resolution, which is worth careful consideration:—

“Whereas her Majesty’s Government have enabled us to provide for the religious instruction of all our students in the endowment of a Theological Faculty under our own exclusive jurisdiction. . . . And whereas the qualifications and character of the persons appointed in the Queen’s College, Belfast, for those classes which the students of this Church have hitherto been required to attend, are such as to justify this Assembly in accepting certificates and degrees from that College, we now permit them to attend the classes of that department in the Queen’s College.”—(Queen’s College Commission, 1858, p. 53.)

## TWO WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

On the other hand, when the Professors were appointed at the same time in the Colleges of Cork and Galway—Colleges professedly established to satisfy the demand of Roman Catholics for Higher Education, and in the midst of communities almost entirely Catholic—“out of twenty Professors in the Galway College there were only two Roman Catholics in the Faculty of Arts, the Professors of Mathematics and of History and English Literature”; “in the College of Cork out of twenty Professors there were three Roman Catholics, but two of these were Professors in Medicine, and the other in Law.” (Evidence of Dr. Starkie before the Royal Commission, Second Report, p. 189).

*In Cork College, as in Belfast, there was not a single Roman Catholic Professor in the Faculty of Arts.*

*In all the three Colleges, the Council, which is the Governing Body, was, as it is to-day, almost entirely Protestant.*

If the heads of the Roman Catholic Church discoun-

tenanced the attendance of Catholic students at Colleges so constituted, does the charge of "illiberality" and "sectarianism" lie well, I wonder, in the mouths of those on whose behalf the foregoing warning had been given to the Government, and to whom there had been meted out by that Government such very different treatment?

If in Birmingham there were established a single endowed College of Higher Education, said to be entirely undenominational and open to all religions on equal terms, but of which *all* the Arts Professors and five-sixths of the Governing Body were Roman Catholics, would Anglicans and Nonconformists think themselves open to charges of "illiberality" or "sectarianism" if they held aloof from such a College, or if they denounced it, as constituted most unsuitably to its surroundings, and most unfairly to the Nonconformist and Anglican denominations? Or is it too much to ask that the religious convictions of the Roman Catholics who form the vast majority of the people of Ireland, should receive, at length, some small measure of the consideration that has been given so abundantly and for so long a time to Irish Protestants and Irish Presbyterians?\*

\* As illustrating how liberally the word "unsectarian" is understood when there is question of Belfast Queen's College, I may, also, refer on this point to Mr. Balfour's speech at Partick on December 2nd, 1889, on the Irish Education Question. Having spoken of different meanings attached to the word "sectarianism," and of the position of Trinity College, Dublin, he proceeded (I quote from the *Times*' Report):—"I turn from it to the case of Queen's College, Belfast. That is one of the institutions which are in theory at least either unsectarian or sectarian in the sense which I explained to you a few minutes ago. But what are the facts about the Queen's College, Belfast, which is certainly the second among the many great educational institutions in Ireland? In that College there are 422 students. Of that number 11, and 11 only, are Roman Catholics.

"It is an interesting fact, and a fact which I see no reason for concealing, that when a vacancy occurred in the Presidency of

## “CLERICAL SEMINARY” AND “MONASTIC TRAINING”?

3. Of the students of University College over 95 per cent. are preparing for purely secular pursuits ; in Belfast Queen's College a large proportion of the Arts Graduates are preparing to enter the ministry of the Presbyterian Church.

Queen's College, Belfast, the General Assembly of that Church or a Committee of that Assembly wrote to me officially and stated that as the large majority of the students of Belfast College were Protestants, and as a large number of the Presbyterian clergy were educated there, they hoped that I would put a Protestant Minister at its head. I thought, and think still, that that request was a perfectly legitimate one ; and accordingly the Irish Government recommended to her Majesty the appointment of a Presbyterian minister last year to the head of the College.”

Here we have it expressly shown to us that in making the appointment to the most important office in the College the Government were asked to make, and did make, its selection—*not on the grounds of educational experience or qualification—but on purely religious and denominational grounds.*

And to understand the full importance of that selection, we must remember that when vacancies occur in the Professorial Staff, the candidates whom the President recommends to the Government are, in the vast majority of cases, appointed by the Government.

Here we see the meaning of “unsectarianism” as it applies to Belfast.

On the other hand, when the appointment of Dr. Starkie to the Resident Commissionership of the Board of National Education made a vacancy in the Presidency of Queen's College, Galway, and in the Professorships which he had also held of Mental Science and of English History and Literature, it might reasonably have been taken for granted that a Catholic, if otherwise qualified, would have been appointed to the vacant posts.

Galway is an intensely Catholic city ; the College was founded expressly to provide for the Higher Education of Catholics in the same manner and degree as Belfast College had been for Presbyterians and Protestants. The late President was a Roman Catholic. The Lord Lieutenant (Earl Cadogan), with whom rested the nomination, had strongly advocated educational justice to Catholics. There was a brilliantly gifted Catholic candidate thoroughly qualified for both the vacant posts—the late Mr. W. P. Coyne, whose premature death a few days ago has been justly lamented as being truly a national loss. Surely here, if ever, Irish Catholics were entitled to take for granted that a Catholic would be appointed.

But no ; the traditions of Dublin Castle were too strong for the Lord Lieutenant ; Mr. Coyne was passed over ; the Presidency was given to the Professor of Natural Philosophy, a North of Ireland Presbyterian ; and the Chair of Mental Science and History to Mr. Trench, a Trinity College Protestant. I make no comment ; let the contrast speak.

“ A COLLEGE FOR PRIVATE PROFIT ” ?

4. As regards the financial administration of University College, the Registrar and Bursar, who is a layman, receives all the fees, submits his accounts to the Council fortnightly, and under their direction makes all disbursements ; the accounts are audited by a public auditor, and the auditor's report is submitted to the body of Professors and Tutors. If any surplus existed after necessary expenditure it would be divided *pro rata* amongst the Professors ; unfortunately, so far there has been only a deficit, for which I, as President, though receiving no salary, have made myself responsible. In the first six years, from 1883 to 1889, that deficit entailed a debt of over £6,000, of which £1,500 still remains.

Those of my Jesuit colleagues (from two to six in number) who have been Fellows of the Royal University, and who received £400 a year each for their work in that capacity, devoted that sum to the maintenance of the College ; and this has enabled me gradually to diminish its debts and to meet the yearly deficit, to keep the College in good working order, and to achieve such measure of success as it has obtained.

“ EPISCOPAL AND CLERICAL DOMINATION ” ?

I have made bold to submit to your Excellency's consideration these details of the spirit and management of a Catholic University College, which is administered by a Jesuit President, but is the property of the Catholic Bishops, who might at any time have resumed possession of it, and yet who never once interfered in its administration ; and I have done so because I think that, if they were more generally known, they would

help to correct the erroneous notions that many people seem to entertain of what the spirit and management is likely to be of such a College as is claimed for Catholics ; that is, a College as satisfactory to Catholics in every respect—in its Faculties, its equipment, endowment and autonomous government, as Trinity College is to Protestants ; a College without tests, and open to all—the best man winning, whether priest or layman—and administered, not as University College has been, by any section of Catholics, but by an academical body truly representing and enjoying the confidence of the whole Catholic community—Bishops, clergy, and laity alike.

Again, I repeat, in face of the foregoing facts and figures I fail to see how the request of Belfast Queen's College for priority of treatment can be maintained.

They seem to me to prove also conclusively :

1st. That, seeing the work done by University College under crying disadvantages of every kind, it is evident that if there were provided such a College for Catholics, with suitable buildings, equipment, and endowment, we might fairly expect still more satisfactory results, and in a far greater quantity.

2nd. That the expenditure of £23,000 a year on the Colleges of Cork and Galway *in their present condition*\* is absolutely indefensible on any principle of just and economic administration of public funds.

3rd. That, as things are, the present distribution of public funds for Higher Education is both economically and educationally unwise and unjust ; and, therefore :—

\* See Appendix, pages 22-30.



4th. That even from the limited point of view here presented, it is a matter of urgency that the question of Higher Education in Ireland should be at once dealt with by the Government.

To prevent any possible misconception of the drift of this letter, I think it right to repeat what I have already said in my evidence before the Royal Commission, when asked by Professor Lorrain Smith, Q. 9,718:—

In view of any permanent arrangement that may be made, do you advocate the continuance of the College, as it exists at present, under the management of the Jesuit Fathers?

Father Delany, R. :—

Certainly not. Such an arrangement would be entirely inadmissible. In the first place, no endowment, however generous, could make of the institution in St. Stephen's-green a suitable University College, still less, a suitable independent University. There is no room for the necessary buildings and grounds. In the next place, even if there were no legislative or other difficulty in the way, I consider that in the contemplated institution there should be room for all the best intellects of the country—the best man winning, whether priest or layman; that it should be national in its constitution, and should be governed from within, not by any mere section of the Catholic community, but by a body thoroughly representative of the whole Catholic people with all its interests, and, therefore, enjoying the confidence of all. (Third Report, p. 361.)

I have the honour to be,

Your Excellency's obedient Servant,

WILLIAM DELANY, S.J.,

*President.*

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE,

DUBLIN, *January 11th, 1904.*

## APPENDIX.\*

The foregoing letter deals more immediately with the appeal made on behalf of Queen's College, Belfast, to have its claims for increased endowment immediately recognised; but the tables there presented make it plain that there is another element in the Irish University Question that calls *imperatively* for the immediate consideration both of the Government and of Parliament: namely, the continuance of an expenditure of £23,000 a year on the Colleges of Cork and Galway in their present condition.

To bring this point out more clearly, I give in tabulated form a comparison of the results obtained at the Arts Examination of the Royal University during the ten years from 1894 to 1903, inclusive, by those two Colleges taken together, and by University College, Dublin.

	Total of Distinctions in all Classes.	Total of First Class Distinctions.	First Class Honours in Classics at B.A.	First Class Honours in Mathematics at B.A.	Gold Medals for Composition.	Gold Medals and Special Prizes for Excellence.	£42 Prizes at B.A.	Studentship £300 at M.A.
<i>Endowments for Arts Faculty.</i>								
£4,500 University Coll., Dublin	704	374	15	9	7	12	30	14
£20,000 { Queen's Coll., Galway { Queen's Coll., Cork	249	86	1	1	0	4	6	1
	65	20	1	1	0	1	1	2
	314	106	2	2	0	5	7	3

\* Throughout this Appendix, as in the foregoing letter, the argument drawn from the comparison of University College with the Queen's Colleges is to be understood, *not* as suggesting that a solution of the Irish University Question might be attempted by an increased dole to University College, which (as explained at the close of the letter) would be totally inadmissible; but as showing by concrete and intelligible facts and figures the indefensibleness of the present distribution of educational endowments.



With these figures before us I ask the question : When the Queen's College Estimates come on for discussion this Session, on what grounds—political or educational or financial—will the Government defend them, whilst ignoring the Report of the Royal Commission and taking no steps to satisfy the just Catholic claims?

Certainly not on any grounds of educational fair play or of the economic distribution of public educational funds.

#### MANIFEST WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.

This, and the foregoing tables demonstrate:—

1. The marked failure of the Queen's College, Galway, and the still more marked failure of Queen's College, Cork, to produce educational results at all proportional to the very large expenditure involved in their maintenance ; whilst that maintenance in its present form is complained of as a grievance by Catholics, for whose benefit these Colleges were originally established.

2. That, as compared with the Colleges of Cork and Galway, Belfast Queen's College has been signally successful. Yet all three Colleges enjoy equal endowments and educational advantages : they are, all three, manned by thoroughly competent Professors, able and willing to do first-rate educational work. The reason of the contrast is found elsewhere : *Belfast College has succeeded, because the Government, as we have seen, took special care in all its appointments to keep that College in harmony with its surroundings, and it therefore meets the wants and wishes of a large section of the population in its neighbourhood ; Cork and Galway Colleges have failed, because they fulfil neither of those essential conditions.\**

3. That the failure of Cork and Galway Colleges is *not* to be attributed, as it has sometimes been, to the lack of Catholic students qualified to receive profitably University education, and eager to obtain it, if they could do so without doing violence to their conscientious convictions.†

\* See page 16.

† This is also proved conclusively by the Results of the Intermediate Examinations, which show that Catholic students have won more than 60 per cent. of the Exhibitions awarded, and that some of the very best Intermediate Schools in Ireland are the Catholic Intermediate Schools in Cork.

4. That in the quantity of educational work done, and much more in the quality of the results obtained, as tested by the examinations of the Royal University, University College, though working under most grievous disadvantages, has more than held its own against all the well-endowed Queen's Colleges, and has very notably excelled the Queen's Colleges of Cork and Galway taken together.

It is plainly a reasonable deduction from these figures, that, if University College enjoyed advantages equal to those possessed by the Queen's Colleges, the comparison of results would tell still more strikingly in its favour.

5. These tables, therefore, demonstrate

THAT THERE IS A GRAVE INJUSTICE DONE TO CATHOLICS  
BY THE EXISTING DISTRIBUTION OF EDUCATIONAL  
ENDOWMENTS,

under which the two Queen's Colleges of Cork and Galway have provided for them by Government splendid buildings, libraries, museums, laboratories, educational appliances of every sort, and a direct endowment costing the State, as shown above from the estimates, over £20,000 a year for their Arts Faculties: whilst University College, though producing educational results far excelling these two Colleges together in quantity and quality, has, beyond the aid indirectly given it by the payment of some of its Professors no provision whatever for the most essential wants of a University College, for buildings or their maintenance, for the necessary working staff, for library, museums, or laboratories, for scholarships or prizes.

Hence, to all who know anything of the working of Institutions for Higher Education, and of the large subsidies required to maintain them, it will be no matter of surprise that the maintenance of University College, even with its present very limited organisation, entails a considerable yearly deficit on those who have made themselves responsible for its working.\*

\* Sir Lyon Playfair, in his speech on the representation of Universities, March 6th, 1885, tells us:—"Foreign countries during the last ten years had made enormous strides in promoting University education. The competition of nations now, both in war and peace, was not

Yet the College, which is so hardly dealt with in the present anomalous distribution of educational endowments, is doing more efficiently the very work for which the State professes to bestow its aid on the favoured but unsuccessful Colleges.

ON WHAT GROUNDS CAN THIS UNEQUAL DISTRIBUTION BE DEFENDED?

Certainly not on political grounds. The Queen's Colleges are repudiated by the great mass of the Catholic population, for whose benefit two at least of them were originally established; University College, on the other hand, was established at great sacrifice by the Catholic body, and it enjoys their confidence.

Certainly not on educational grounds. If success in imparting purely secular education, as tested by a purely secular examining body, were made the measure of the educational endowments given by the State, the above tables demonstrate that University College, even now in its comparatively undeveloped condition, deserves a considerably larger endowment than Cork and Galway Colleges taken together.

a competition either of brute force or of local advantage, but was a competition of intellect; and foreign nations recognised this in a remarkable way. Jules Simon had stated that 'the best educated nation would be the greatest nation, if not to-day, certainly tomorrow.' See what France had done. Before the great Revolution France had twenty-two Universities, which spread intellectual life throughout all the provinces. Napoleon destroyed these Universities, and centralised them into one single University in Paris. Just before the war with Germany, University education in France had fallen so low that the subventions amounted to less than £10,000. Immediately after the war the French Institute for a whole fortnight discussed the question why it was that France had shown an intellectual paralysis in the war; why had not any great men come forward in the hour of danger? The answer was that higher education had been crushed out. France had recognised the position and since 1868 had spent £3,280,000 in rebuilding the colleges throughout the provinces. The subvention for University education alone was now £500,000 per annum. *When Germany took Strasburg the first thing she did was to rebuild the University of that small town at an expense of £711,000, and she now gave it £46,000 a year for University Education.* Germany had twenty-four Universities, and spent annually £400,000 for University education, besides £200,000 more to provide the Institutions with the modern appliances of science. The Netherlands, with a population about the same as Scotland, and with a revenue of only £9,000,000, had four Universities, and gave £136,000 a year for University education."

Will it be maintained, in the face of figures like these, that the English Government has made satisfactory provisions for the higher education of Irish Catholics?

Nor can it be defended on the plea that, where the State gives public funds for education, the education given should be open to all alike. University College, though under strictly Catholic management, opens its lecture halls to all who choose to accept the education there given, and has always had a considerable percentage of non-Catholics (often including Protestant clergymen) attending its classes.

Still less can it be defended on the ground that, when the State gives public funds for education, it should distribute them impartially without regard to religious denominations. This is exactly what the English Government under present arrangements does *not* do in Ireland.

It is a plain fact that, under the present educational arrangements, the Catholics of Ireland, though numbering three-fourths of the population, do not receive the one-twentieth part of the public endowments for higher education, whilst a rich minority enjoy a practical monopoly of them.

We are forced therefore, logically, to the conclusion, that, if the Government persist in maintaining the present unjust distribution of these endowments in Ireland, they are spending the public funds on the Queen's Colleges, and more especially on the Colleges of Cork and Galway—whilst withholding them from University College, Dublin—not because the Queen's Colleges are giving to all comers a better secular education or a greater quantity of it; not because they in a greater degree meet a popular want, and enjoy popular confidence; but simply and solely because in these Colleges, planted in the midst of a people most devoted to their religion, it is the fundamental principle of their constitution, that religion and all that belongs to it should be totally ignored.

To make this abundantly clear, let us see in the concrete how this system of distributing educational rewards affects Catholic students. The Results of the Examinations of the Intermediate Education Board and of the Royal University furnish conclusive evidence on this point. We find on the lists of successful candidates the names of many Catholic students, who won the highest places at the Intermediate Examinations, and won the highest distinctions again at the Royal University, and who, nevertheless, see the rivals, whom they defeated in both

these competitions, in the enjoyment of scholarships and prizes from which they, although victorious, are debarred by conscientious convictions.\*

Thus, under this system, the Government, which is responsible for it, is made to say to successful Irish students: "We acknowledge that you have shown yourself the best men; our own examiners have declared it; but unfortunately you and your parents foolishly desire to combine religious training with secular learning; and therefore we can do nothing for you. Be wise, and put away your absurd scruples; get rid of priestly influence; enter our Colleges where you will not hear a word about religion; and you will find scholarships waiting you, to be had for the asking, with a tithe of your present knowledge and industry."†

Are there not some grounds for the charge, that under such a system, endowments for higher education in Ireland are made to serve, not for the endowment of learning, but for the endowment of irreligion; and that, whilst professing to be impartial and merely *non-religious* in its administration of educational funds, the English‡ Government in Ireland is entirely one-sided, and most decidedly anti-Catholic in the real working of its provisions for higher education?

\* See Reports of Queen's Colleges (Ireland) Commission, qq. 8297-98, 8497, Appendix, pp. 507-510. See also this Appendix, pages 36-41.

† In the official Report of the President of Queen's College, Cork, for the Session 1896-7, we find these figures:—Students following Arts Courses: Catholics, 5; other denominations, 26. Total, 31. Yet for 31 Arts Students there were 37 Arts Scholarships provided at a yearly cost of more than a £1,000.

In the Report of the same College for the Session just closed (1902-3) we read that there were 30 Matriculated Students in Arts of whom 23 held Scholarships and 3 Exhibitions: but, strange to say, *there were only 6 of the number learning Latin*. Yet the State spends £10,000 a year on an Arts Faculty producing such results.

‡ The English Government in Ireland is expressly so described, because it is well known to all in Ireland who are interested in education, that Irish Governments, whether Liberal or Conservative, have long since recognised the injustice and anomaly of the present educational arrangements, but that they have been powerless to remedy them, because English Cabinets and English Parliaments had settled that Irish Catholics should educate their children—not, indeed, according to the ideas of the vast majority of Englishmen and Scotchmen, who are opposed to the exclusion of religion from education—but according to the ideas of English secularists and Irish Orangemen.



A really impartial, merely *non-religious*, State would have regulated its action on these broad principles :

1. It is a matter of very great importance to the State to promote higher education amongst its inhabitants of *all* religions.

2. It is the duty of the State, on grounds of public justice, to provide educational assistance in equal measure for *all* its subjects : it is the duty of the State, on economic grounds, to shape its grants in that form in which they will be turned to best account in producing educational results.

3. The State will therefore devote public funds for the advancement of higher education impartially amongst all its subjects ; and, in order to have results in proportion to its expenditure, it will aim at securing, by its distribution of public money, the best attainable education of the largest number.

4. Being purely secular, however, and non-religious, the State will take cognisance only of education in matters of secular learning, and will give its aids and rewards solely for the furtherance of such education.

5. Therefore, efficiency in imparting secular education shall be the condition and the measure of State aid to teachers and to teaching Institutions ; success in the acquisition and display of secular learning shall be the condition and the measure of its rewards to students.

6. In order that the public money may not be squandered, the State will take its own measures to establish and maintain a suitable standard of secular education, and to test the efficiency of teaching Institutions, and the success of their pupils in reaching that standard.

7. But these conditions being once secured, the State will impose no religious *nor anti-religious* test ; will not enquire whether, along with their secular knowledge, students may have been taught any or no religion, whether the institutions are managed by Catholic or Protestant, Jew or Pagan.

These are the broad, intelligible principles on which an impartial, or a merely *non-religious* State, would distribute

its educational endowments in a country of mixed religions. The Irish Intermediate Education Act is, on a limited scale, an application of these principles to secondary education ; and hence, despite many serious defects from the purely educational point of view, it was one of the most cordially accepted Educational Acts ever passed by Parliament ; simply because, within its own scope and limits, it deals with students and teachers of all denominations on principles of perfect impartiality.

But when we apply these obvious principles to the present distribution of endowments for higher education in Ireland, we find every one of them flagrantly violated.

The State, far from deeming it a matter of importance to its welfare to promote the higher education of Irish Catholics, has effectually shut them out from such education.

The State does *not* deal out equal measures to all its subjects : a small and wealthy minority monopolise the endowments : the great majority of the people are unprovided for.

Efficiency in imparting secular learning is *not* made the measure or the condition of State aid to Institutions ; nor is success in acquiring and displaying secular knowledge made the measure or the condition of the State's rewards to students.

The State leaves unrecognised, Colleges proven to be efficient in imparting secular learning ; it persists in maintaining at great cost Colleges proven to be unsuccessful ; and the only assignable reason for the distinction is that the unsuccessful Colleges ignore religion, and this is held to compensate for their failure in producing scholars ; the successful Colleges produce the scholars, but teach them also the religion of their parents, and that is held sufficient to condemn them.

That is, in plain words, that the Government *applies and enforces an anti-religious test* in its distribution of educational endowments.

The people in Ireland who wish to divorce secular education from religion in the training of their children do not number one-thousandth of the population. The Government identify themselves with this infinitesimal fraction of the people, adopt their educational views, and force them on the whole country ; and, strangest thing of all, they loudly profess that they do so in the name of religious liberty and perfect equality.

They have put an end, they boast, to the old system of religious ascendancy and intolerance, when a Protestant minority held exclusive possession of educational endowments; and meantime they build up a new and, to Catholics, a much more objectionable ascendancy of *anti-religious* intolerance, under which a mere handful of Secularists are made to dictate to the whole nation the conditions of its public institutions for higher education.

To the great mass of Irish Catholics, Trinity College, in its exclusively Protestant days, was less objectionable than the Queen's Colleges, which ignore religion altogether; and it was certainly not more objectionable to Catholics in those days, though an entirely Protestant institution, than it is now, when, we are told, it has been made entirely undenominational.

#### THE "UNDENOMINATIONALISM"? OF TRINITY COLLEGE.

At present the only University Institution in Ireland which has Collegiate buildings and grounds suited to accommodate resident Students, and which is therefore in a condition to provide the full advantages of University life, is Trinity College.

The history and character—past and present—of that institution are set forth briefly, but fully, in the following petition which was presented to Parliament by its Vice-Chancellor, Vice-Provost, and over 6,000 of its graduates, asking that its Protestant constitution might be preserved unimpaired. They point out that:—

"The University of Trinity College, Dublin, was founded by Queen Elizabeth, in 1591, for the purpose of promoting education in Ireland on the principles of the Protestant religion. That for three centuries Trinity College has faithfully fulfilled the trust imposed on it by its founder and benefactors, and has in consequence enjoyed the confidence of the Protestant people of Ireland, . . . and therefore your petitioners pray . . . that the Protestant constitution of the University of Dublin may be preserved unimpaired."—(Parliamentary Paper, No. 110. Session, 1870.)

Notwithstanding that petition, Fawcett's Act was passed, in 1873, abolishing religious tests, and thus, *in theory*, making Trinity College undenominational. But what are the plain facts? I appeal to the testimony of



its ardent admirers, and of those who know it most intimately.

Witness Professor Mahaffy, who, in an article strongly deprecating the introduction into Dublin University of a Roman Catholic College on the ground that thereby "hostile forces would be empowered to sow dissension in the Councils of the University," goes on to inform the public that "the present government and policy of the College (Trinity), though secular and admitting all persons to its honours, is distinctly Protestant."—(*Nineteenth Century*, July, 1892, page 95.)

Again: At the opening meeting of the College Historical Society of Trinity College for the Session of 1891-2, the subject selected by the Auditor of the Society for his inaugural address was "University Education in Ireland." Among the principal speakers were Judge Webb, Professor Mahaffy, and Lord Justice Fitzgibbon. Judge Webb said "Their University was founded by Protestants, for Protestants, and in the Protestant interest. A Protestant spirit had from the first animated every member of its body corporate. At the present moment, with all its toleration, all its liberality, all its comprehensiveness, and all its scrupulous honour, the *genius loci*, the guardian spirit of the place, was Protestant. And, as a Protestant, he said, and said it boldly, Protestant might it evermore remain."

Professor Mahaffy "agreed thoroughly with his friend Judge Webb," and Lord Justice Fitzgibbon said that Judge Webb had told them truly that the University in which they stood was founded by a Protestant, for Protestants, and in the Protestant interest.

Yet the institution thus described by its own friends,—an institution of which the Governing Body and the whole Professoriate are Protestant,—is the institution where Irish Catholics are bidden to go, if they desire University Education.

Now, I know, that in all religions there are men—often most amiable and well-meaning men—who are so steeped in religious prejudices that reasonable argument is thrown away on them. To them I make no appeal. But there are thousands of men—Anglicans, Non-conformists, Protestants, Orangemen—who do not belong to that class; men, who are, perhaps, strongly hostile to the Roman Catholic Church, but who do not permit their hostility to blind them to reason.

To all such men I make an earnest appeal, and I ask

them "on what grounds do you—while you profess (I am sure honestly) to uphold the principle of religious equality, and while you stoutly insist on it, as applied to yourselves—on what grounds do you defend your position, when to the demands of Irish Catholics for mere equality—that is, for an Institution as satisfactory to them as Trinity College is to Protestants—you reply:—‘Trinity College is equally open to you, as to every one else. If you want Higher Education you must go there. You are at no disadvantage.’”

“If a Roman Catholic priest were appointed President of Queen’s College, Belfast, with all the Professors also Catholics, would you tell the General Assembly that they must accept such a situation, and hold that their Students were at no disadvantage?”

“If we could imagine that, in an English town, where the *only* school open to the children and maintained from public funds, was an Anglican school originally founded for the spread of Anglicanism amongst the Nonconformists, and since then and at present entirely controlled by the parson and his Anglican churchwardens, with Anglican teachers and Anglican reading books,—would you, I ask, or any fair-minded man, hold that Nonconformist parents and children in that town were at no grievous disadvantage? Would you call them “sectarian” and “illiberal” and “priest-ridden” if they protested that, as taxpaying citizens, they should have fair play, and that they, who were the majority, were surely entitled to equal privileges with the minority—to at least an equally well-provided school of their own?”

“And if you would so protest, and struggle—as you most assuredly would unceasingly, until you had secured your full rights—on what grounds do you persist in withholding from Irish Roman Catholics the same equality of civic rights and the same respect for their religious convictions that you insist on having for yourselves?”

I fail to see them. If such treatment were inflicted on a Nonconformist community in one English town, you would rightly consider it a crying injustice that called for immediate redress: how much graver, then, the injustice where a whole people are the sufferers, and where successive Governments, whilst fully acknowledging the grievance, take no action whatever to remove it?

More than thirty years have passed since Mr. Glad-

stone condemned the conditions of Higher Education in Ireland—so far as Catholics were concerned—as scandalously bad ; the present Prime Minister has again and again declared that Irish Catholics labour under a serious grievance in regard to Higher Education ; successive Lord Lieutenants and successive Chief Secretaries have repeated that declaration ; the present Government, in 1901, appointed a Royal Commission to enquire and report on the subject ; that Commission emphatically condemned the existing state of things, and by that condemnation made matters much worse, disparaging, as it did, the educational status and organisation of the Royal University, to the serious injury of its graduates and of the teaching institutions which prepare Students for its degrees.

Yet the Government, which appointed that Commission, and which has had before it for the past year the excellent practical recommendations which the Commissioners make in their Report, simply ignores both Commission and Report.

The old excuses are all gone. The Catholic Bishops are *not* “impracticable.” Whilst for educational as well as religious reasons they would prefer a separate Catholic University, they have declared their willingness to accept an undenominational joint University, either a modified University of Dublin or a Royal University modified according to the suggestions of the University Commission.

Far from demanding that either the University or the Catholic College forming part of it shall be under episcopal or clerical control, they have expressly declared again and again that they will accept a Governing Body predominantly lay. They ask for no tests either in the University or the College. The chief element in the demand which the Bishops—and with them the whole body of Irish Catholics—put forward, is simply this : that there shall be provided for Catholics a College as satisfactory to Catholics in every respect in the completeness of its Faculties, in its equipment and endowment, and in the character of its autonomous government as Trinity College is to Protestants ; a College without tests and open to all, and governed, not by any section of Roman Catholics, but by an academical body truly representative of the Catholic community—laity and clergy alike.

This, too, is in substance, the chief recommendation of the Royal Commission.

Yet a Government, whose Prime Minister, Lord Lieutenant, and Chief Secretary are, strongly and avowedly in favour of a just settlement of Catholic claims, decline to take action upon that recommendation; and why? Not because they think it unreasonable or impracticable; but because (as the Chief Secretary himself explained in the House of Commons) inasmuch as questions of religion were involved, it could not be settled until there was a general agreement about it in Ireland; which was in other words equivalent to saying that three millions of Irish Catholics must wait for a removal of their acknowledged educational grievances, until it shall please some thousands of Ulster Orangemen generously to concede it.

I ask in all seriousness, is not such a reply—after fifty years' waiting—plainly tantamount to a declaration that in the matter of Higher Education Irish Catholics cannot expect justice from a Parliament at Westminster?

I would respectfully commend to the consideration of Mr. Wyndham's dissentient colleagues the following weighty words spoken on a kindred subject by Lord John Russell in the House of Commons, on April 18, 1845, in the debate on the increase of the Maynooth Grant:—

“Are we not bound to say to the people of Ireland: ‘We engaged at the time of the Union to govern Ireland in a spirit of equality with England—we engaged to consider Irishmen as we consider Englishmen: to allow the same rights and privileges to the Irish as we claim for ourselves, and to consider the questions with regard to Ireland as we would consider them with regard to ourselves?’ If that be the case, it will be totally inconsistent with our saying that ‘our own religion is so exclusively true that we cannot bear anything like an equality or anything like a favour shown to the people of Ireland.’ If we say that such are our religious principles, that we defy these demands for justice, then will come more fiercely than ever those demands for the Repeal of the Union which we all deplore. Either we must say that ‘we will carry out the compact in the spirit which was declared at the time, and that we will fulfil the compact, not only to the letter but with all that kindness and all that affectionate regard and all that conciliation which Ireland should have from England’; or we must say that ‘our religious opinions will not allow us to act with equity and justice towards Ireland,’ and then we must

*renounce the connexion and the compact and we must give them back their Legislature to enable them to decide for themselves as they think best. . . . I own that I consider this a dilemma from which you cannot escape. . . . If you will maintain the Union, you must convince the Roman Catholic people of Ireland that you will treat them as you treat the Protestant people of England.”—Hansard, v. 79, p. 1011.*

I claim to have shown that to-day, nearly sixty years after these words of warning were uttered, Irish Roman Catholics are *not* receiving equal treatment nor educational Fair Play. During that time successive Prime Ministers, Lords Lieutenant, and Chief Secretaries have acknowledged the grievance, and recognised the manifold serious injury thereby inflicted on the social and industrial well-being of the country.

Yet now, when we dared to flatter ourselves that at long last justice was about to be done,—with a Prime Minister and an Irish Secretary both avowedly sympathetic, both fully conversant with the gravity of the question and with the pressing need of having it satisfactorily settled—we see Mr. Wyndham compelled to declare in the House of Commons that the Government were not prepared to deal with it, *because it involves a question of religion.*

Surely it cannot be, that we are to look on that declaration as the final word of English statesmanship in reply to the demand of Irish Catholics for Educational Fair Play?

WILLIAM DELANY,

*President.*

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN.

*February, 1904.*



# TABLES

**Giving the Names and Places of the First Ten Exhibitioners at the Senior Grade Intermediate Examinations in each year from**

**1889 to 1898,**

**Showing the Universities in which they matriculated, and the Colleges in which after matriculation they pursued their Undergraduate Studies.**

---

A comparison of the lists published yearly by the Irish Intermediate Education Board with the lists of Exhibitioners, Scholars, and Prizemen recorded in the Calendars of the Irish Universities, will make clear that the vast majority of their most distinguished University Students have been already competing against each other in the Intermediate Examinations.\*

The following Tables show:—

1. That of the 100 most distinguished Intermediate Students in the ten years, 1889 to 1898, 84 matriculated in one or both of the two Irish Universities—65 in the Royal University, 7 in the University of Dublin, and 12 others in both Universities.

2. That 19—or little more than one-fifth of the whole—entered Trinity College, Dublin, and that 23 entered one or other of the Queen's Colleges (Belfast 18, Cork 3,

---

\* Thus in the Trinity College Calendar for 1900-1 the names of all the Junior Exhibitioners except two are found in the Senior Grade Lists for 1898, 1899, or 1900. Nine of the 10 Sizars on the same page were Intermediate Students; so were the two men who won Studentships, the two Brooke-prizemen, and all the Science Scholars.



Galway 2); whereas 25 entered University College, Dublin, amongst whom were 8 of the 10 Students who had gained the first place; and

3. They show—by the figures and letters in brackets—the generous pecuniary help that is provided for the Students of Trinity College and of the Queen's Colleges by College Scholarships. Students of University College, Dublin, have no such help, nor have they the advantages of suitable Buildings, Laboratories, Libraries, and other educational appliances provided for them from the public funds.

It may be added that there is no religious test imposed on Students entering University College; it is equally open with Trinity College or the Queen's Colleges to Students of every denomination, and some of its most distinguished Students have been Protestants. It has no Divinity School, and does not train young men for the priesthood. The majority of its Professors are laymen, many of them married, and some of them Protestants.

Yet Trinity College, which has much more of a denominational character—which *has* a Divinity School, and is governed by a Board of 8, of whom 5 are Clergymen of the Disestablished Church—has £38,000 a-year of endowment from public sources, with Grounds, Buildings, Laboratories, and educational appliances worth much more than a million; the Queen's Colleges cost the State nearly £38,000 a-year; whilst University College, though training a larger proportion of the most gifted Irish Students, has for its whole endowment the salaries paid by the Senate of the Royal University to 15 of its Fellows who receive £400 a-year each for the *double duty* of acting as Examiners in the University, and of teaching at University College—the teaching endowment, therefore, to University College not exceeding £4,500 a-year (£300 each), and given in the most inconvenient form. It has no grounds nor suitable buildings, no equipment, its President and executive officers are unpaid, it has no Scholarships to help poor students of ability; and yet from the number of brilliant boys who, notwithstanding these drawbacks, for conscientious

reasons prefer it to Trinity College or the Queen's Colleges, University College has more than held its own in the unequal competition with the generously endowed Queen's Colleges.

In the following lists, where figures are given, they represent the value of Scholarships held in a Queen's College.

Ex. = Exhibitioner in Trinity College. S. = Sizar. Sch. Scholar. The Exhibitions are worth £25 a-year for two years. Sizarship £35 a-year. Scholarship £60 a-year. The Sizarships are tenable for four years from the Junior Freshman year; the Scholarships until the Scholar is of Master's Standing, that is, until 7 years from his entrance in College.

The Exhibitions may be held with Sizarships.

Name	Univ.	College.
<b>1889.</b>		
1. Nairn, J. A.	R.	Univ. Coll.
2. Burke, W.	R.	"
3. Corcoran, 'T.	R.	"
4. Kelly, J.	R.	Blackrock.
5. Gillespie, J. R. (£48)	R.	Q. C. Belfast.
6. Browne, T. B. (Ex.)	R. & D.	Wesley Coll. and T.C.D.
7. Magner, Aug.	R.	Univ. Coll.
8. Palmer, J. J. (Ex.)	D.	T. C. D.
9. Blanchot, H.	R.	Blackrock.
10. Purcell, J. P.	—	—

<b>1890.</b>		
1. Ebrill, Th.	R.	Univ. Coll.
2. Manning, Jas.	—	—
3. Colthurst, Jos.	—	—
4. M'Culla, Jas. (£112)	R.	Q. C. Belfast.
5. Wisdom, J. H.	—	—
6. O'Brien, Wm.	—	—
7. Devitt, Lau.	R.	Univ. Coll.
8. Alton, Geo. (Ex. Sch.)	R. & D.	T. C. D.
9. Doyle, G. J.	—	—
10. Macken, —	R.	Univ. Coll.

**1891.**

1. Egan, M. F.	R.	Univ. Coll.
2. Rice, J. (£112)	R.	Q. C. Belfast.
3. Conran, M.	R.	Univ. Coll.
*4. M'Swiney, J.	R.	"
5. O'Connell, J. C.	R.	Chr. B. Cork.
*6. Kelleher, Stephen (£112)	R.	Q. C. Cork.
7. Garratt, R. (Ex.)	D.	T. C. D.
*8. Beare, T. J. (£112)	R.	Q. C. Belfast.
9. Kevany, J. P.	—	—
10. Fox, W.	R.	—

**1892.**

1. Keane, M.	R.	Univ. Coll.
2. Enright, J.	R.	"
3. Clifton, H. C.	R.	"
4. Sheridan, J. P.	R.	"
5. Campbell, S. G.	R.	Pr. Study.
6. Watt, Sam (Ex. S.Sch.)	R. & D.	Pr. Study later T. C. D.
7. Hackett, J. J.	R.	Univ. Coll.
8. Harvey, T. G. (£112)	R.	Q. C. Belfast
9. Gleeson, P. J.	—	—
10. Morrissey, T. J.	R.	Blackrock.

**1893.**

1. Ryan, Andrew (£48)	R.	Q. C. Cork.
2. Conroy, Jas.	R.	Univ. Coll.
3. Paul, F. J. (£112)	R.	Q. C. Belfast.
4. Spence, J. F. (£48)	R.	"
5. Minford, Wm. (£72)	R.	"
6. Morgan,	R.	Maynooth Coll.
7. Halliday, R. J. (£72)	R.	Q. C. Galway.
8. Byrne, J.	R.	Univ. Coll.
9. Byrne, A. T.	—	—
10. Fleming, R. J. (Ex. Sch.)	D.	T. C. D.

**1894.**

1. McAllister, A. P.	R.	Univ. Coll.
2. Ebrill, George	R.	"
3. O'Brien, Steph.	—	—
4. Shine, John	R.	Clonliffe Coll.
5. Caldwell, V.	—	—

\* These Students having graduated in the Royal University, subsequently entered Trinity College.

- |                               |         |                             |
|-------------------------------|---------|-----------------------------|
| 6. McFarland, W. G. (S. Sch.) | R. & D. | Meth. Coll.<br>and T. C. D. |
| 7. Burkitt, H. (Ex. S.)       | R. & D. | T. C. D.                    |
| 8. McCarron, J.               | R.      | Univ. Coll.                 |
| 9. Merriman, P. J.            | R.      | "                           |
| 10. Smyth, S. A. (£112)       |         | Q. C. Belfast.              |

**1895.**

- |                               |    |                |
|-------------------------------|----|----------------|
| 1. Kent, P.                   | R. | Univ. Coll.    |
| 2. Strain, T. G. (£120)       | R. | Q. C. Galway.  |
| 3. MacGarry, C. J.            | R. | Univ. Coll.    |
| 4. Collins, D.                | —  | —              |
| 5. Bresland, C. W. (Ex. Sch.) | D. | T. C. D.       |
| 6. Jennings, Chr. (£24)       | R. | Q. C. Belfast. |
| 7. Smithwick, M.              | R. | Rockwell.      |
| 8. Connolly, V. (Ex. Sch.)    | D. | T. C. D.       |
| 9. Vinycomb, B. (£112)        | R. | Q. C. Belfast. |
| 10. Chart, D. A. (£88)        | R. | Q. C. Cork.    |

**1896.**

- |                           |         |                   |
|---------------------------|---------|-------------------|
| 1. Kettle, Thos.          | R.      | Univ. College.    |
| 2. Byrne, P.              | R.      |                   |
| 3. Houston, C. C. (£24)   | R.      | Q. C. Belfast.    |
| 4. Houston, R. M. (£48)   | R.      | "                 |
| 5. Joynt, G. A. (Ex.)     | R. & D. | T. C. D.          |
| 6. Ryan, John             | R.      | Castleknock Coll. |
| 7. Harris, G. A. (Ex. S.) | R. & D. | T. C. D.          |
| 8. O'Donnell, M. J.       | —       | —                 |
| 9. Gibbons, E.            | R.      | —                 |
| 10. White, J. J.          | —       | —                 |

**1897.**

- |                                |         |                               |
|--------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|
| 1. O'Reilly, J. J.             | R.      | Univ. Coll.                   |
| 2. Clarke, J. C. (Ex. Sch.)    | D.      | T. C. D.                      |
| 3. Wasson, J. C. (Sch.)        | R. & D. | Magee Coll.<br>and T. C. D.   |
| 4. Adamson, F. L. (£24)        | R.      | Q. C. Belfast.                |
| 5. Hawthorne, W. (£48)         | R.      | "                             |
| 6. Oliver, T. S. (Ex. S.)      | R. & D. | Meth. Belfast<br>and T. C. D. |
| 7. Harper, E. H. (Ex. S. Sch.) | R. & D. | T. C. D.                      |
| 8. Stodart, J. C.              | R.      | Campbell Coll.                |
| 9. Daly, R.                    | R.      | Pres. B. Cork.                |
| 10. Knox, W. G. (£72)          | R.      | Q. C. Belfast.                |

## 1898.

1. Fisher, C. D.	R.	—
2. Leathem, G. (£24)	R.	Q. C. Belfast
3. Martin, W.	R.	Blackrock.
4. Dennehy, W.	—	—
5. Murphy, A. J.	R.	—
6. Moore, H. (Ex. S.)	D.	T. C. D.
7. Lloyd, W. H. (Ex. S.)	R. & D.	T. C. D.
8. Johnston, J. (£24)	R.	Q. C. Belfast.
9. White, N. B. (Ex. S.)	D.	T. C. D.
10. Meyer, Ch.	R.	—

Of the 100 Students who obtained the first ten places in the years 1889 to 1898 inclusive, 77 Matriculated in the Royal University, of whom 12 Matriculated also in the University of Dublin; 7 others Matriculated in that University, making a total of 84 who Matriculated in a University\*.

Of these 25 entered University College, 19 entered Trinity College,\* 18 entered Queen's College, Belfast, 4 entered Blackrock College, 3 entered Cork College, 2 Galway, and 1 Magee College.

Again, of the 60 Students who obtained the first *six* places in the same ten years, 1889 to 1898, 19 entered University College, 12 entered Queen's College, Belfast, 9 entered Trinity College, 2 Queen's College, Cork, 2 Blackrock College, 1 Galway College, and 1 Magee College.

Of the 10 Students who obtained *first* place in the same years, 8 entered University College.

These figures help to explain the success of University College in the Royal University Examinations as shown in the preceding letter.

\* Also 3 others entered Trinity College after Graduation in the Royal University (see page 39).









3 0112 105324682